



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

EVIDENCE—TESTIMONY AS TO STATEMENTS NOT REBUTTABLE BY COLLATERAL EVIDENCE.—Defendant, indicted for wife murder, pleaded that he committed the act in the heat of passion, alleging that deceased had confessed to illicit relations resulting in her pregnancy. To rebut the claim of such confession the state, over objection, introduced testimony to prove that in fact the wife was not pregnant, arguing that it was extremely unlikely that she would have confessed to such a condition when it did not exist. *Held*, the evidence should have been rejected on the ground that it raised collateral issues, *People v. Harris* (N. Y., 1913) 102 N. E. 546.

The Court of Appeals relied largely upon two cases in its decision, *People v. Webster*, 139 N. Y. 73, and *Shipp v. Commonwealth*, 124 Ky. 643, 99 S. W. 945, 10 L. R. A. (N. S.) 335. Neither of these is directly in point. In the former there was no issue as to the fact that the confession was made, the evidence being offered not to corroborate the claim of a confession but as justification for the killing, and it was rejected as incompetent for this purpose. In the latter case also it was admitted that the confession had been made and there being no issue on this point it was properly held that evidence as to the wife's reputation for chastity was inadmissible. On the other hand the question was ruled upon in *Knapp v. State*, 168 Ind. 153, and *Commonwealth v. Hourigan*, 89 Ky. 305, and the evidence held admissible. This is the view favored by Professor WIGMORE, (2 ILL. L. REV. 35), who says, "Assuming that for any purpose the objective fact has a bearing, the rule against contradicting a witness on a collateral point should not be allowed to stand in the way; for if the fact is relevant at all it is not any more collateral than the rumor of it." Undoubtedly such evidence has probative value, as is conceded by the New York court in the principal case, and, it seems, should be admitted as a strict matter of logic. So far the decided cases on this precise point are few, and it can not be said that the law governing it is definitely settled. The practical argument against the admission of such evidence however is strong; that it tends to raise collateral issues and produce confusion.

HUSBAND AND WIFE—NO RIGHT OF ACTION BY WIFE FOR LOSS OF CONSORTIUM.—Plaintiff's husband was injured through the negligence of defendant, and she seeks to recover for the loss of companionship, comfort, and support of her husband. The trial court rendered judgment for plaintiff and defendant appealed. The judgment was at first affirmed, but on a rehearing, the court *held*, that no personal right of the wife is violated in an injury to the husband caused by a mere negligent tort. *Gambino v. Manufacturers Coal and Coke Co.* (Mo. App. 1913), 158 S. W. 77.

At common law a husband can recover for the loss of consortium of his wife. *Guy v. Livefey*, 2 Cro. Jac. 501; *Hyde v. Scyffor*, 2 Cro. Jac. 538; 3 BLACK, COM. 140. Even under the modern statutes emancipating the wife, this right is still generally unimpaired, *So. Railroad Co. v. Crowder*, 135 Ala. 417; *Skoglund v. Minneapolis St. Ry. Co.*, 45 Minn. 330, though in Massachusetts and Connecticut neither spouse can now recover for the loss of the consortium of the other. *Marri v. Stamford St. R. Co.*, 84 Conn. 9, 33 L. R. A.